

## FINANCIAL AID FOR THE INDIVIDUAL SCHOLAR: PRELIMINARY

## REPORT OF A STUDY OF THE STATUS OF SELF-DIRECTED RESEARCH

by Elbridge Sibley \*

New insights into human problems, as well as important new ideas about the universe and its parts, often originate in the minds of individual scholars who are following their own curiosity along paths which may seem aimless to the general public and futile to their own colleagues. In the very nature of the case, the ultimate value of an unborn idea is unpredictable. Most of the estimated annual expenditure in the United States of nearly two billion dollars of public and private funds for research is devoted to the organized application of known principles to problems of immediate concern to those who control the funds. In this situation it is paradoxically possible that the solitary work of pursuing knowledge for its own sake may languish while ever larger outlays are made for research motivated by immediately practical considerations.

The organizations sponsoring the study here reported have for many years offered small grants-in-aid to individuals engaged in research of their own choosing. The study was primarily intended to relate to this type of subsidy. However, since grants-in-aid constitute only a part of the real economic investment in original scholarship, and since money from whatever source is only one of many elements which are essential if research is to flourish, the scope of the investigation had to be extended to include the total situation in which scholars work.

\* The study, which has been jointly supported by the American Philosophical Society and the Social Science Research Council, was announced in *Items*, December 1948, pp. 6-7. The writer is indebted to Calvin W. Stillman, who did much of the work.

Only the financial aspect of this situation will be considered here. Other matters, including the crucial question of the relation of research and teaching in academic institutions, will receive attention in the full report, which is scheduled for completion within the next few months.

In this paper there are frequent comparisons of amounts of support afforded to scholars in different fields of learning, but these comparisons must not be allowed to overshadow the fundamental fact that scholars of all disciplines have a common interest in securing and maintaining conditions favorable to original intellectual activity. Exponents of any discipline would be regrettably shortsighted to claim increased support merely on the ground that some other discipline is at present more liberally subsidized than their own.

## PROCEDURES AND DATA

In order to learn about the actual demand for and distribution of grants-in-aid, abstracts were made of some 900 applications recently acted upon by five organizations offering grants throughout the nation in support of research planned and directed by the applicants themselves.<sup>1</sup> Members of university and college faculties

<sup>1</sup> Organizations furnishing records are the American Council of Learned Societies, the American Philosophical Society, the Permanent Science Fund (a trust administered by the American Academy of Arts and Sciences), the Research Corporation (special postwar grants only being included), and the Social Science Research Council. The data are all for postwar years except in the case of the ACLS, whose grant program had not been resumed after World War II.

compose more than four fifths of the clientele of these grant-giving organizations, and constitute the only identifiable large group in American society from which continual contributions to knowledge in the arts and sciences can be expected.

If the study were confined to the actual clientele of certain grant-giving organizations, few valid inferences could be drawn concerning the larger universe of scholars who have not sought aid from them. Therefore members of the faculties of 16 selected universities and colleges were asked to report their experience in seeking, or not seeking, opportunities for original scholarly work. Questionnaires were distributed with the endorsement of the president or dean of the institution, and despite their complexity and length, 74 percent were returned.<sup>2</sup> Informal interviews on the campuses yielded many insights which would not have been suggested by questionnaire responses alone.

Among the 16 institutions, which cannot be named as assurance was given that the information provided would remain anonymous, are six state universities of which five are members of the Association of American Universities; four private universities of which two belong to the Association; one sectarian university; four accredited private liberal-arts colleges; and one large municipal college. Seven institutions are in Northeastern states, seven in the Middle West, and two in the South. Although none of the half-dozen most famous universities in the country is included, three of those in the sample would probably be among the dozen highest-ranking universities. Two of the liberal-arts colleges are nationally recognized for the caliber of their faculties and their high scholastic standards. All the institutions in the sample can be considered as standing above the average of institutions of their respective types.

Data from the 16 institutions cannot, therefore, be regarded as typical of all American colleges and universities; they can be taken as more or less representative of the places where opportunities for original scholarship are relatively favorable. Whether these opportunities are favorable enough in any absolute sense is a question for the reader to ponder.

## DISTRIBUTION OF GRANTS BY FIELDS

Three out of ten of the faculty members returning questionnaires reported that during the year 1948-49 they received some special support, in cash or in kind, for "research, writing, or other creative work of their own choosing, without supervision or direction." Table

<sup>2</sup> In small institutions questionnaires went to the entire faculty of arts and sciences; in large institutions, to a random or stratified sample. Professional and technological school faculties were not canvassed.

1 shows the approximate amounts of aid reported by faculty members in the several fields. They were asked to report not only cash subsidies but also the estimated value of supplies and services furnished especially for their work.

The proportions of respondents reporting some aid ranged from a minimum of 16 percent in the humanities to 31 percent in the social sciences and 44 percent in the natural sciences.<sup>3</sup> The relative positions of the three fields will surprise no one who is familiar with the academic scene. There is reason to believe, however, that the absolute figures are somewhat exaggerated as a result of incomplete returns.<sup>4</sup>

TABLE 1  
SUPPORT FOR INDIVIDUAL RESEARCH, BY FIELDS, REPORTED BY A  
SAMPLE OF UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGE FACULTY MEMBERS

Field	Number of respondents	Number receiving any support	Percent receiving any support	Estimated amounts of support	
				Per recipient	Per respondent
Total, all fields	1,303	375	29	\$2,800	\$800
Humanities	427	67	16	800	130
Social sciences	341	107	31	2,000	620
Natural sciences	407	180	44	4,100	1,810
Other and unclassified *	128	21	16	1,900	320

\* Members of arts and science faculties not classifiable in the above categories.

Partisans of the less-favored disciplines will doubtless point with dismay to these statistics. Two justifications which are sometimes advanced deserve consideration. These are, first, that research in some fields is unavoidably more expensive than in others, and second, that one reason why workers in some fields receive little support is that they do not demand more.

As to the comparative costliness of research in different fields, it must be pointed out that the costs are determined partly by the "logic of the materials," but also partly by custom and habit. Some tasks which can be done by a single person without assistance of any

<sup>3</sup> For purposes of this study, all anthropologists, historians, and psychologists have been arbitrarily classified as social scientists. Analysis of the data shows that transfer of some of these to the other fields would lessen the differences between fields somewhat, but not enough to alter the general nature of the findings.

<sup>4</sup> Consultation with officials of most of the institutions confirmed the assumption that those who did not return questionnaires included relatively greater numbers of persons who are inactive in research. On the extreme assumption that the 73.7 percent who returned questionnaires included all those receiving any aid, the percentage of faculty members receiving aid would be reduced from 29 to 22, and the figures for the separate fields would be correspondingly reduced, there being no great differences in the rate of response for the several fields.

As attention is to be directed to relative rather than absolute figures, unadjusted data are given in all tables.

kind could nevertheless be more efficiently accomplished if funds were used to provide equipment and auxiliary services. A scholar can, and usually does, serve as his own secretary, at the expense of time which could be devoted to things a secretary is not qualified to do. Few distinguished chemists, on the other hand, are seen washing their own glassware.

Some rough indications of the comparative importance of different objects of expenditure by workers in different fields can be seen in Table 2, which shows the relative frequencies of specified items in budgets submitted by recipients of grants from the five organizations. As detailed budgets were included in only a few of the records abstracted, while the principal objects of expenditure were indicated in about half of the cases, the percentages in this table are derived from the numbers of cases in which a given item appears. At the two extremes, grants for research in the humanities are most often given for travel<sup>5</sup> either in this country or abroad, while supplies and apparatus are the items most often listed by natural scientists. Hire of clerical and research assistants bulks relatively large in the budgets of workers in humanities and social sciences. In interpreting these frequencies, it must be recalled that the absolute amounts of money awarded in the three fields are quite unequal.

TABLE 2  
RELATIVE FREQUENCIES OF CERTAIN OBJECTS OF EXPENDITURE OF  
GRANTS-IN-AID, BY FIELDS<sup>a</sup>

Object	Field		
	Humanities	Social sciences	Natural sciences
Total, all objects specified below	100%	100%	100%
Travel expense (including foreign travel)	47	43	11
Wages of assistants (clerical or technical)	30	37	15
Procurement or copying of documentary materials	20	12	2
Supplies	3	6	42
Apparatus	0	2	28
Publication of results	0	1	2

<sup>a</sup> Total numbers of grants: humanities, 84; social sciences, 141; natural sciences, 253.

Data from the questionnaire survey of faculty members indicate that special aid given by the universities and colleges to their own members is distributed in essentially similar ways in the respective fields. Some very important but imponderable contributions of the

<sup>5</sup> To anticipate some findings which will appear in the subsequent longer report, it may be observed that natural scientists seem to be more accustomed to carrying on research on their own campuses than their colleagues in other fields whose materials are not readily isolated for study in laboratories. Ironically, however, the belief is still current that a scholar in any field other than a "laboratory science" needs only a book.

academic institutions to research in all fields are excluded from these statistics. They include maintenance of the scholar, and the provision of facilities and services which, although essential to the educational activities of the institution, are also useful in original scholarly work.

The cost of the university library is sometimes cited as representing a large contribution to scholarship in social sciences and humanities, and as balancing the larger direct appropriations to departments of natural sciences. Yet it seems doubtful that there are many institutions where, if the precise allocation of library costs could be determined, it would be found that equal total outlays were made for original work in the three fields.

A circumstantial answer to the suggestion that the humanities and social sciences receive little because they ask for little may be found in Table 3, in terms of ratios of amounts granted to amounts requested from the five organizations studied. Natural scientists not only request but also receive larger amounts from these particular organizations. The fact that the relative discrepancy between requests and grants is greatest in the social science field may perhaps reflect the fact that in recent years social scientists have been raising their sights. By comparison with social scientists, scholars in the humanities appear more inclined to acquiesce in the existing distribution of funds.

TABLE 3  
AMOUNTS REQUESTED AND AMOUNTS AWARDED: 850 APPLICATIONS  
TO 5 ORGANIZATIONS

	Humanities	Social sciences	Natural sciences
Numbers of applications	173	343	334
Number of awards	93	132	253
Percent of applications granted	54	38	76
Per capita amounts requested	\$660	\$1,115	\$2,616
Per capita amounts granted	\$337	\$267	\$1,910
Percent of requested amounts granted	51	24	73

## COMPARISONS WITH SUPPORT FROM OTHER SOURCES

How small grants to individuals can most effectively be administered with a view to stimulating original scholarly work is obviously conditioned by the availability of other support for the same clientele. As shown in Table 4, funds from grant-giving organizations account for about 22 percent of the total amount of special aid reported by questionnaire respondents. Government agencies contributed nearly twice as much, with funds from the Military Establishment alone almost equalling those from all private organizational



sources.<sup>6</sup> In this situation, the importance of devoting private funds to purposes which cannot be served by other sources is strikingly apparent.

TABLE 4  
SOURCES OF SUPPORT RECEIVED BY FACULTY MEMBERS

	Percent of respondents aided by each source	Per capita amount of support from each source	Percent of total amount of support
Total, all sources	29 <sup>a</sup>	\$800 <sup>b</sup>	100
University or college	24	250	30
Private organizations	7	180	22
U. S. Military Establishment	3	170	21
Other government agencies	4	160	20
Other and unspecified sources	2	60	7

<sup>a</sup> Items below add to more than 29 percent because some individuals received support from two or more sources.

<sup>b</sup> Rounded figures.

When the foregoing data are given separately for the three principal fields of scholarship, as in Table 5, it is found that the same fields which receive greater support

TABLE 5  
SUPPORT RECEIVED BY FACULTY MEMBERS, BY FIELDS, BY SOURCES

Source	Per capita support <sup>a</sup>			Percent of respondents receiving support <sup>b</sup>		
	Humanities	Social sciences	Natural sciences	Humanities	Social sciences	Natural sciences
Total, all sources	\$130	\$620	\$1,810	16	31	44
University or college	80	220	490	12	24	32
Private organizations	30	310	270	4	11	7
U. S. Military Establishment	0	10	520	0	2	15
Other government agencies	0	80	420			
Other and unspecified sources	10	20	150			

<sup>a</sup> Rounded figures.

<sup>b</sup> Items in these columns add to more than their totals because some individuals received support from two or more sources.

<sup>c</sup> Less than 0.5 percent.

from outside sources are also more liberally supported by the universities and colleges themselves. Only funds from private organizations deviate from the general pattern, providing slightly more aid to social scientists than to natural scientists. Research in the humanities

<sup>6</sup> This despite the fact that many very large government-supported research projects carried on in universities are excluded from these statistics as not representing the self-chosen and self-directed work of individuals.

receives by far the least support from each of the several sources.

From another viewpoint, support for the humanities comes mostly from the universities and colleges, while nearly two thirds of the reported funds for the social sciences and nearly three fourths of those for natural sciences come from outside sources. Funds from private organizations, which account for 22 percent of the grand total, comprise 24 percent in the humanities, 48 percent in social sciences, and only 14 percent of the total subsidies for natural sciences.

About one third of the recipients of funds from private organizations also received special aid for the same projects from their own institutions; in other words, they were about 50 percent more likely to receive local support than were their colleagues who did not receive grants from private organizations. Insofar as such organizations aim to stimulate local support, this ratio may seem disappointing, but it probably reflects to some extent the fact that certain grant-in-aid programs are explicitly intended to assist individuals in institutions which have no funds for research.

## REGIONAL AND INSTITUTIONAL COMPARISONS

An organization pursuing the policy of helping scholars whose own institutions offer them little or no financial aid faces a dilemma if it seeks at the same time to judge projects on their own merits, for it is not surprising that many of the ablest scholars are found in institutions which support research liberally. Similar considerations apply to the regional distribution of grants. In Table 6 it appears that, as far as the five grant-giving organizations covered by this study are concerned, the percentage of applications granted is nearly constant for all regions and types of institutions. The apparently equal treatment of the several categories of applicants may in fact conceal preferential treatment of those from disadvantaged areas and institutions. Or, conceivably, it may reflect the fact that only the ablest members of the latter groups submit applications, or are even aware that grants-in-aid of research can be obtained.

Table 7 presents some circumstantial evidence bearing upon these questions. The second column shows that, while the percentage of faculty members receiving grants from private organizations is positively correlated with the standing of the three groups of universities, the percentage is about as high in certain independent liberal-arts colleges of good standing as in universities of medium rank.

TABLE 6

DISPOSITION OF GRANT-IN-AID APPLICATIONS BY FIVE ORGANIZATIONS,  
BY GEOGRAPHIC AREA, AND BY TYPE OF INSTITUTION

Location and affiliation of applicants	Number of applications	Number of grants	Percent granted
Totals	913	510	56
<i>Area</i> <sup>a</sup>			
Northeast	330	198	60
Middle West	164	89	54
West	135	88	65
South	112	62	55
<i>Type of institution</i> <sup>a</sup>			
Universities belonging to AAU	257	152	59
Other universities <sup>b</sup>	178	103	58
Colleges formerly accredited by AAU <sup>c</sup>	266	154	58
Other colleges <sup>c</sup>	36	19	53

<sup>a</sup> Excluding foreign and nonacademic applicants.<sup>b</sup> Institutions conferring Ph.D. degrees.<sup>c</sup> Colleges separate from universities.

The third and fourth columns of Table 7 relate to ratings of the questionnaire respondents in terms of their competence as original scholars. Lists of respondents were submitted to persons well acquainted in their respective fields of scholarship, who were asked to classify them in three categories:

A—the 10 percent in each field whose contributions to knowledge are generally recognized as most significant;

B—those who are recognized as competent original scholars, though less outstanding than group "A";

C—those who are unknown, or known not to deserve "A" or "B" rating.

The judges were asked to evaluate quality rather than quantity of production. While the procedure has been criticized as subject to errors of personal judgment, it is believed that groups A and B undoubtedly are of higher average ability than group C.

In Table 7 it will be noticed that the proportion of recognized scholars is about the same in the middle group of universities and in the upper group of liberal-arts colleges, and that approximately the same percentage of members of each of these groups received individual assistance from private organizations. The last column of the table shows ratios of the numbers receiving such support to the numbers recognized for scholarly competence. Perhaps the most interesting single figure in this column is the last one, which shows a higher ratio in the less distinguished liberal-arts col-

TABLE 7

SUPPORT FROM PRIVATE ORGANIZATIONS GRANTED TO INDIVIDUAL  
SCHOLARS IN CERTAIN GROUPS OF INSTITUTIONS

Groups of institutions	i Number of respondents	ii Percent receiving funds	iii Percent of respondents rated "A" and "B" <sup>a</sup>	iv Ratio of ii to iii
<i>Universities</i>				
U-1: 3 outstanding, members of AAU	334	10	55	.2
U-2: 4 less distinguished, members of AAU	310	9	36	.2
U-3: 3 nonmembers of AAU	266	3	25	.1
<i>Liberal-arts colleges</i>				
C-1: 2 outstanding	148	8	39	.2
C-2: 2 superior but less distinguished	114	7	13	.5

<sup>a</sup> Rating of scholarly competence; see text for explanation.

leges than in any other class of institution. Bearing in mind that the figure is subject to a relatively large sampling error, it can only be remarked that it is consistent with the hypothesis that the custodians of funds in grant-giving organizations are sometimes disposed to assist a scholar in an unfavorable situation rather than his equally able or possibly abler colleague whose institution makes more provision for its faculty's original work.

Some readers may find the foregoing statistics unrepresentative of the situation in their own institutions. If, however, publication of these gross data serves to stimulate stocktaking on the part of individual universities and colleges, it is hoped that something may have been accomplished toward improving the conditions of scholarly activity. At worst, the figures presented in this section should encourage rather than discourage faculty members of smaller and less wealthy institutions who hope to find support for their scholarly enterprises.

As remarked at the outset of this paper, financial data can portray only certain elements in the total situations which stimulate or inhibit independent scholarship. The policies and folkways of academic institutions and the prevailing attitudes of their members determine in large measure whether such financial resources as may be available will bear fruit, and whether or not aggressive efforts will be made to secure added support when it is needed. These questions will be considered at some length in the projected full report on the study.

# INTERUNIVERSITY SUMMER RESEARCH SEMINAR ON PERCEPTION AND LEARNING

SINCE publication in the March *Items* of the Council's plans for initiating a program of interuniversity summer research seminars, a fourth seminar has been arranged for the summer of 1950. A group of psychologists who are interested in the convergence of three broad areas of theory and research—perception, conditioning and learning, and motivation—will meet at Cornell University during July and August. Robert R. Blake of the University of Texas will act as chairman, and the other participants will be Urie Bronfenbrenner and Robert B. MacLeod of Cornell, George S. Klein of the Menninger Foundation, Richard L. Solomon of Harvard University, and Wilson J. Walthall, Jr. of the University of Wyoming. They represent widely different areas of research; at the same time the theoretical orientation of their work is broadly comparable.

The seminar will direct its attention toward systematizing research on the determinants of human behavior when a choice of responses is involved. This problem provides a focus for relating many diverse concepts, such as dispositional systems in personality analysis, various

selectivity phenomena within perception, and determinants of strength of response tendencies in conditioning and learning theory. An inquiry into research data and theory concerning the concept of recognition will provide the point of departure for seminar discussions. The procedure outlined by the group includes three phases: adoption of a common vocabulary of descriptive concepts; critical review of a selected body of pertinent data and theory; delineation of an appropriate theoretical framework, and formulation of specific questions in terms suitable for empirical testing.

As indicated in the announcement of these seminars in the March issue of *Items*, the seminars organized for this first summer are frankly experimental. It is hoped that a substantial number of proposals for seminars on a variety of research topics to be held during the summer of 1951 will be submitted for consideration by the Council prior to November 1950. Such proposals should be addressed to Pendleton Herring, President, at the New York office of the Council, and early submission will be helpful.

## COMMITTEE BRIEFS

### INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION AMONG SOCIAL SCIENTISTS

Roy F. Nichols (chairman), Frederick S. Dunn, Robert B. Hall, Otto Klineberg, Donald Young; *staff*, Richard H. Heindel.

At a meeting on March 30 the committee considered suggestions which have been received concerning the need for evaluation of programs involving the international exchange of persons. Organizations concerned with exchanges of students and teachers are interested in the possibility of promoting research to appraise the results. Such research might prove useful in developing future programs as well as in the understanding of international relations. To examine further the feasibility of research on the problem of evaluation, the committee sponsored a small conference in New York on April 27. At this conference, which had before it a preliminary inventory of the research situation, there was detailed discussion of the factors which should be taken into account, appropriate research methods, and the scope and procedures of possible projects. The committee agreed that it would seek to arrange for preparation of a research planning memorandum which would include suggestions for various pilot studies.

The conference was attended by Gertrude Cameron and Donald Cook, U. S. Department of State, Division of Ex-

change of Persons; Emily L. Ehle, Institute for Research in Human Relations, Philadelphia; John F. Embree, Yale University; Wilbert Hindman, University of Michigan, on leave from the University of Southern California; Charles P. Loomis, Michigan State College; Kendric Marshall and Paul Smith, U. S. Office of Education; Donald J. Shank, Institute of International Education; John A. Wallace, Beaver College and University of Pennsylvania; Elmo C. Wilson, International Public Opinion Research; Howard Wilson, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace; and members of the committee and Council staff.

### INTERNATIONAL EXCHANGE OF PERSONS

(Joint with the American Council on Education, American Council of Learned Societies, and National Research Council)

Aaron J. Brumbaugh (chairman), M. H. Trytten (secretary), Detlev W. Bronk, George S. Counts, Mortimer Graves, Pendleton Herring, Charles F. Voegelin; *staff*, Gordon T. Bowles, executive secretary, Francis A. Young, Elizabeth P. Lam.

Application for an award for the academic year 1951-52 under the Fulbright programs in the United Kingdom and British Colonial Dependencies, Belgium and Luxembourg, France, Greece, Italy, The Netherlands, Burma, The Phil-



ippines, New Zealand, and Norway, may be made between June 15 and October 15, 1950. Application forms and information regarding the appropriate program will be sent after June 15 to all individuals who have expressed an interest in making application for an award in one or more of the foregoing countries. It is too late to apply for an award in these countries for the academic year 1950-51.

Interim programs for India, Egypt, and Iran for the academic year 1950-51 were announced by the Department of State in early May. Application may be made for an award in these three countries at this time. The closing date for the mailing of applications is June 15, 1950. Application for an award for the academic year 1951-52 may be made after June 15.

Agreements have been signed with Australia, Turkey, and Korea but no information has been received as to when the programs will be initiated. Negotiations are in progress with Pakistan, Siam, and Austria. The committee will send to interested individuals application forms and information regarding each of these programs as they are initiated.

Arrangements may be made through the Fulbright program for foreign lecturers to teach in universities and colleges in the United States during the academic year 1951-52. Since Fulbright awards to citizens of foreign countries are paid in the currency of their own country and cover only the cost of travel to and from the United States, it is necessary for them to secure dollar support from other sources for living expenses and travel within this country. Invitations to teach in American universities and colleges will enable more scholars in Fulbright countries to apply for an award, thereby increasing the benefits of the program to those countries and also enriching the academic life of this country. Invitations to foreign scholars may be issued in either of two ways. An American institution may invite a particular professor or a research scholar to serve on its staff. In this case the institution is expected to advise the foreign scholar to file an application for a travel grant with the U. S. Educational Commission which administers the program in his own country. Upon the recommendation of this Commission, the application is forwarded through the Department of State to the Board of Foreign Scholarships for final action. Or a university or college may utilize the facilities of the Fulbright program to find a qualified person to fill a particular opening. Inquiries regarding the procedure to be followed in this case should be addressed to the Executive Secretary of the Committee on International Exchange of Persons, 2101 Constitution Ave., Washington 25, D. C. E. P. L.

## LABOR MARKET RESEARCH

Dale Yoder (chairman), E. Wight Bakke, J. Douglas Brown, Philip M. Hauser, Clark Kerr, Charles A. Myers, Gladys L. Palmer, Carroll L. Shartle; *staff*, Paul Webbink.

On May 9-10 the committee and the University of Minnesota held a conference at Minneapolis on studies of labor productivity in individual plants. A variety of outstanding

analytical approaches were examined critically on the basis of statements by key investigators. These statements dealt with productivity accounting at the plant level, by Hiram S. Davis of the University of Pennsylvania; a resumé of the Survey Research Center's findings and techniques in studies of factors accounting for differences in productivity among labor groups, by Robert Kahn of the University of Michigan; the productivity studies of the U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, by George E. Sadler of the Bureau's staff; experimental studies in group organization affecting productivity, by Alex Bavelas of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology; studies of the reduction of resistances to changes in methods, by Richard A. Lester of Princeton University; and an account of a plant study undertaken in Minneapolis, by Einar Hardin of the University of Minnesota.

The committee is continuing its efforts to develop parallel studies of factors affecting labor mobility, in six urban areas. Its new *Memorandum on University Research Programs in the Field of Labor* will be issued in June.

## ORGANIZATION FOR RESEARCH

Louis Wirth (chairman), Gordon W. Blackwell, Willard Hurst, John A. Perkins, Stanley F. Teele, Donald H. Wallace, Malcolm M. Willey, Arnold Wolfers; *staff*, Paul Webbink.

The committee's new *Directory of Social Science Research Organizations in Universities and Colleges*, replacing a mimeographed Tentative Directory issued in 1947, is being published by the Council in June. Copies are available upon request to the Council's New York office. The *Directory* provides a mailing list of 280 organizations conducting or financing social science research in 104 universities and colleges. Work has been resumed on an extended report or handbook dealing with problems of research organization in the universities.

## PACIFIC COAST COMMITTEE

### ON COMMUNITY STUDIES

Leonard Broom (chairman), Allen L. Edwards, William S. Robinson, Calvin F. Schmid, Eshref Shevsky, Robert C. Tryon, Paul Wallin.

The committee met in Seattle on April 22-23. Charles Bowerman and Fred Shandley of the University of Washington were present as guests of the committee. Discussion centered around the following progress reports: "Area Analysis in the Los Angeles Study," by Eshref Shevsky; "Differential Psychosociology: Theory, Method, and a Partially Worked-out Case," by Robert C. Tryon; "Application of the Cornell Technique of Scale Analysis to Ecological Data," by Calvin F. Schmid in collaboration with Charles Bowerman and Fred Shandley; "The Determination of Tract Homogeneity and the Use of Enumeration District Data in Measuring Internal Tract Variation," by Leonard Broom and William S. Robinson. These reports constitute steps in the preparation of a memorandum on methodological problems of community research. L. B.

## PACIFIC COAST COMMITTEE ON OLD AGE RESEARCH

Harold E. Jones (chairman), Ray E. Baber, Roy M. Dorcus, Lloyd Fisher, James Hamilton, Oscar Kaplan, Clark Kerr, Elon Moore.

The committee met in Santa Barbara on April 27 to discuss current and projected studies. Considerable attention was given to plans for the interuniversity summer research seminar to be held in Berkeley in July and August. Among the topics recommended for the seminar were: (1) sampling problems in studies of older workers; (2) methods of assessing physiological and psychological aging; (3) study of existing polling survey materials, with reference to the availability of data on the attitudes of older persons; (4) preparation of an inventory of "limited type" research projects, as a guide for graduate students and others; (5) an evaluation of materials, drawn from different fields, appropriate for seminars and for other college and university courses on aging.

H. E. J.

## PACIFIC COAST COMMITTEE ON SOCIAL STATISTICS

George M. Kuznets (chairman), Maurice I. Gershenson, Emily Huntington, Davis McEntire, Calvin F. Schmid.

With the idea of stimulating closer working relations between mathematical statisticians and social scientists whose research is primarily quantitative, the committee has initiated a series of informal conferences on statistical techniques. The first of such conferences was held on January 24 and dealt with probabilistic models underlying classification techniques. Joseph L. Hodges of the Statistical Laboratory, Department of Mathematics, University of California, Berkeley, was the main speaker. The participants in this conference were drawn largely from various social science departments on the Berkeley campus, including agricultural economics, anthropology, business administration, psychology, public health, and social welfare. At the second meeting in this series, held on March 23, Harry M. Hughes of the Statistical Laboratory led a discussion of the use of classification techniques in identifying accident proneness.

The committee sponsored a conference on measurement of regional distribution of income, in Sacramento, May 18-19. The conference opened with a dinner meeting arranged by the committee and the Sacramento Statistical Association. The first day of the conference was devoted to discussion of Department of Commerce estimates of state income payments with particular reference to Pacific Coast states. The discussion on the second day centered on income studies being made in California, Oregon, and Washington. Charles F. Schwartz of the Department of Commerce and Nathan M. Koffsky were among the participants.

G. M. K.

## POLITICAL BEHAVIOR

V. O. Key (chairman), Angus Campbell, Alfred de Grazia, Oliver Garceau, Avery Leiserson, M. Brewster Smith, David B. Truman.

The committee is concerned with the development of theory and improvement in methods which are needed if social science research on the political process is to be more effective. As a preliminary step in the accomplishment of this objective, Oliver Garceau has carried out on behalf of the committee a reconnaissance of work already under way. His survey in no sense provides a complete inventory but rather presents for committee consideration some of the principal approaches and focal points that seem significant to social scientists interested in the study of political behavior. His findings indicate considerable current research activity that can be embraced under such categories as voting behavior, legislatures, comparative government, analysis of group processes, leadership, social status, communications and opinion. As might be expected, there is diversity and unevenness, but at the same time an encouraging vitality of interest and experimentation. In presenting his report for discussion at the first meeting of the committee, held in New York on March 25, Mr. Garceau said in part:

Both in an over-all program of research and in separate projects, the political scientist is necessarily concerned with a continuum of relationships between the individual and the macrocosm of the total political community, and between both and the active minority of insiders at the key points of decision making. With this major, and perhaps distinguishing preoccupation, the strategy of political behavior research will be to select the most revealing points in this continuum, but it also will be to devise concepts and perspectives which will increase our understanding of the relationships along the whole continuum. A good deal of social science research is concentrated at either extreme, the individual and the power centers of bureaucracy, party, interest group, legislature. Seeing clearly the interactions and the working links between these two focal points is one of the pressing requirements, for it is our present inability to explain or describe a total pattern that colors much of the research in progress and its reception both by lay and professional publics.

The committee is attempting to define the "total pattern" for research concerning the political process, with particular attention to the relationship of the various social sciences to the "continuum" referred to above. At a meeting on April 29, Angus Campbell led a discussion of the approach of social psychology to the study of politics, and Burton Fisher of the Survey Research Center at the University of Michigan reported on a recent study of public opinion and policy. Gabriel Almond of the Institute of International Studies at Yale University presented his analysis of the "elite groups" and "attentive publics" concerned with American foreign policy. Further meetings are planned at which members of the committee and one or two guest speakers will present for committee consideration research methods which they are using in current work. At the next meeting, to be held on May 27, David B. Truman will report and Robert K. Merton will be the guest speaker.



## SLAVIC STUDIES

(Joint with the American Council of Learned Societies)

Philip E. Mosely (chairman), Ernest J. Simmons (secretary), Percy E. Corbett, Merle Fainsod, Robert J. Kerner, Geroid T. Robinson, S. Harrison Thomson, René Wellek.

The committee held its third annual meeting on April 8, at the offices of the Social Science Research Council. In addition to the full membership, Mortimer Graves and Pendleton Herring of the sponsoring Councils and Sergius Yakobson of the Library of Congress were present.

The committee examined in detail the work of the *Current Digest of the Soviet Press* and discussed ways and means of increasing its support through subscriptions. The high standards of selection of materials and of careful editing, which have been established by the editor, Leo Gruliov, and his staff, were strongly commended. The committee expressed in resolutions its deep appreciation of the support and cooperation given by the ACLS and its officers in the first period of operation, and its gratitude for the new appropriation made by the Rockefeller Foundation to cover the estimated deficit during 1950-52. It reported in detail on the great value of the *Current Digest* in teaching and research dealing with Soviet developments.

The committee reviewed the postwar experiences of centers of Slavic studies in the procurement of current Soviet publications and noted the steady decline in new receipts. It canvassed various avenues for improving the flow and distribution of new research materials.

Mr. Yakobson reported on the program of distribution of surplus items held by the Library of Congress, which has progressed more slowly than was expected. The chairman of the committee was directed to circularize the cooperating libraries, urging prompt fulfillment of their part of the program. Upon hearing Mr. Yakobson's report on the status of the plan for similarly distributing surplus holdings of periodicals and newspapers, the committee recommended that these materials be offered first to complete existing strong sets, in order to round out as far as possible the present holdings of research libraries.

Special attention was given to the problem of preserving and distributing, on microfilm, sets of early postrevolutionary newspapers and periodicals; and the unique importance of this source material was emphasized. A program in this field would require the preparation of complete runs, through the cooperation of several repositories, and an inquiry into the willingness of libraries to purchase the microfilms, as the cost of making the negative could be shared by a number of institutions. The committee strongly urged the adoption of a program of microfilming early Soviet sets, in order to ensure their preservation and to broaden the facilities available for research. It recommended that the Library of Congress be asked to add this valuable service to those which it is now performing for the development of Slavic studies, and that an active search be made for financial support for the program.

Mr. Graves informed the committee of the status of the ACLS Russian Translation Program. After the publication of the first eight volumes in the series new arrangements would be needed for publishing the remaining sixteen items. The committee also discussed a comprehensive report on the need for further translations in the Slavic field, presented by Mr. Wellek, chairman of the Subcommittee on Slavic Translation and Reproduction Program (which includes Frederick C. Barghoorn, Cyril E. Black, Alexander Gerschenkron, Wacław Lednicki, Avrahm Yarmolinsky).

Among other items of business the committee considered the role of undergraduate area programs, development of Slavic studies in the fields of music and the fine arts, creation of new tools for study and research, the situation of refugee scholars, and the status of the *American Slavic and East European Review*.

P. E. M.

## SOCIAL RELATIONS ASPECTS

### OF INTERNATIONAL TENSIONS

Donald Young (chairman), Frederick S. Dunn, John W. Gardner, Robert K. Merton, Morris E. Opler.

The committee, which has served in an advisory capacity, completed its assignment with publication on May 25 of Council Bulletin 62, *Tensions Affecting International Understanding*, by Otto Klineberg. The bulletin is a survey of the results of research on aspects of human behavior which have a bearing on relations between nations, with particular emphasis on areas on which further research is needed. Its preparation was sponsored by the Council at the request of the U. S. National Commission for UNESCO to aid UNESCO in planning its studies of tensions affecting international understanding, of which the author was Director during 1948-49.

A chapter on "Personality in Relation to Nationality" discusses the extent to which the populations of different nations may be said to have distinctive characters. The author examines the evidence, from the accounts of travelers in foreign countries, studies by anthropologists, census data and statistics on crime and other social problems, interpretations by psychiatrists and psychoanalysts, results of medical studies, the characteristics of moving pictures and other media of mass communication, as well as the findings of social science research on communities, public opinion, attitudes, and child training and education. Other chapters are concerned with the degree of truth in the ideas held by people of one nation concerning their own and other nations and the dangers of thinking of groups and nations in stereotyped terms; the problem of attitude formation and the techniques which can be used for changing attitudes in directions favorable to international understanding; and the influences which may contribute to the development of either aggressive or cooperative attitudes in international relations. On each subject Mr. Klineberg has summarized the relevant research literature and indicated the problems on which research should be undertaken.

# PERSONNEL

## RESEARCH TRAINING FELLOWSHIPS

Following its meeting on March 11, the Committee on Social Science Personnel—Edward P. Hutchinson (chairman), Donald T. Campbell, W. W. Hill, Richard H. Shryock, Frank A. Southard, Jr., and Paul Webbink—announced the award of 16 new research training fellowships:

- Eugene P. Banks, Ph.D. candidate in anthropology, Harvard University, for a field study of the culture of the Caribs of Dominica.
- Ralph H. Bowen, Ph.D. Columbia University, Assistant Professor of History, Columbia University, for research in France on the emergence of scientific method in history and the social studies in the Enlightenment.
- Marvin Frankel, Ph.D. candidate in economics, University of California, for research in England on the development councils as administrative organs for the private sector of British industry.
- Peter J. Gay, Ph.D. candidate in political theory, Columbia University, for research in Holland and the United States on Eduard Bernstein and revisionism: a study in constitutional socialism.
- Andy F. Henry, Ph.D. candidate in sociology, University of Chicago, for further training in mathematics and statistics.
- Stanley B. Kurta, Ph.D. candidate in economics, Johns Hopkins University, for analysis of the variation of individual productivity of employees in a large printing establishment.
- Harvey Leibenstein, Ph.D. candidate in economics and demography, Princeton University, for further study in demographic statistical techniques, econometrics, and mathematics.
- Harry Levin, Ph.D. candidate in psychology, University of Michigan, for research on the learning of social drives (postdoctoral fellowship).
- Seymour Z. Mann, Ph.D. candidate in political science, University of Chicago, for research on the processes of policy formation in Congress.
- Theodore M. Mills, Ph.D. candidate in sociology, Harvard University, for experimental research on the integration and disintegration of small groups.
- Leonard Reissman, Ph.D. candidate in sociology, Northwestern University, for research on levels of aspiration and social mobility.
- Russell F. Rhyne, Ph.D. candidate in political science and Instructor in Engineering, University of California, for predoctoral study in political science.
- Jeremy A. Sarchet, Ph.D. candidate in human relations, University of Chicago, for research on the methodology of small group studies.
- Monroe G. Sirken, Ph.D. candidate in sociology, University of Washington, for further study in mathematics and mathematical statistics, and in-service training in survey methodology (postdoctoral fellowship).
- Melford E. Spiro, Ph.D. candidate in anthropology, Northwestern University, Assistant Professor of Anthropology, Washington University, St. Louis, for research in Israel on personality development and structuralization in a cooperative colony (postdoctoral fellowship).

Gordon F. Streib, Ph.D. candidate in sociology, Columbia University, Instructor in Sociology, Cornell University, for training and research on the communications process in an underdeveloped community.

## AREA RESEARCH TRAINING FELLOWSHIPS AND TRAVEL GRANTS

Since making the appointments announced in the March issue of *Items*, the Committee on Area Research Training Fellowships—Philip E. Mosely (chairman), Cora Du Bois, Merle Fainsod, Robert B. Hall, Melville J. Herskovits, Roy F. Nichols, Thorsten Sellin, Lauriston Sharp, and Charles Wagley—has awarded the following fellowships:

- David W. Ames, Ph.D. candidate in anthropology, Northwestern University, for research in Africa on the ethnography and acculturation of the Wolof people of Gambia.
- Roman Bernaut, Ph.D. candidate in economics, Columbia University, for research in the United States on the grain problems in the U.S.S.R. and the Five Year Plan.
- John P. Carter, Ph.D. in economics, University of California, Assistant Professor of Business Administration, University of California, for research in Western Europe on war-induced changes in transportation.
- John B. Cornell, Ph.D. candidate in anthropology, University of Michigan, for research in Japan on the comparative social organization of a lowland and a mountain village in Okayama Prefecture.
- Alexander Dallin, Ph.D. candidate in history, Columbia University, for research in Europe on German policy toward occupied Russia, 1941-44.
- Paul Farmer, Ph.D. Columbia University, Associate Professor of History, University of Wisconsin, for study in France of recent social politics with special reference to conservative social thought since 1930.
- Norton S. Ginsburg, Ph.D. University of Chicago, Visiting Assistant Professor of Geography, Ohio State University, for research in Japan on the role of the Inland Sea in the Japanese economy.
- Marvin Harris, Ph.D. candidate in anthropology, Columbia University, for research in a Brazilian folk community, with special reference to culture change.
- Charles B. McLane, Ph.D. candidate in public law and government, Columbia University, for research in the United States and Europe on Soviet policy toward Chinese Communists, 1935-49.
- Edward Norbeck, Ph.D. candidate in anthropology, University of Michigan, for research in Japan on the culture of a fishing village, with special reference to westernization.
- Walter A. Rickett, Ph.D. candidate in oriental studies, University of Pennsylvania, for predoctoral study and research at Tsinghua University, Peking.
- Arnold A. Rogow, Ph.D. candidate in politics, Princeton University, for research in the United Kingdom on the role of business interests in the development of the social service state, with special reference to the history and development of the Federation of British Industries.

Seymour Rotter, Ph.D. candidate in international relations, Columbia University, for research in the United States and Europe on Soviet and Comintern policy toward Germany, 1919-23.

Gene Sosin, Ph.D. candidate in Slavic languages, Columbia University, for research in the United States on the Soviet Children's Theatre as a medium of education.

Charles J. Stanley, Ph.D. candidate in history and Far Eastern languages, Harvard University, for research in the United States on the modernization of Chinese public finance.

Laurence W. Wylie, Ph.D. Brown University, Associate Professor of Romance Languages, Haverford College, for research in France on the ethnology of a rural community.

Ben Zimmerman, Ph.D. candidate in anthropology, Columbia University, for research in Brazil on the processes of culture change in rural communities of northeast Brazil.

The committee also voted four conditional fellowship awards which will be announced in a later issue if accepted.

Travel grants were awarded to the following:

Robert E. Dickinson, Ph.D. University of London, Professor of Geography, Syracuse University, for research on the character and distribution of population pressures in southern Italy.

Paul Fisher, J. D. University of Vienna, Assistant Professor of Economics, Dartmouth College, for research on postwar works-council legislation in selected European countries.

Russell H. Fitzgibbon, Ph.D. University of Wisconsin, Professor of Political Science, University of California at Los Angeles, for research on governmental organization and operation in Uruguay.

M. M. Knight, Ph.D. Clark University, Professor of Economics, University of California, for study of postwar conditions in Morocco, Algeria, and Tunisia.

Ilse Lichtenstadter, D. Phil. Oxon., Associate Professor, The Asia Institute, New York, for research in Egypt on the elementary education of girls.

#### GRANTS-IN-AID

At its annual meeting on March 29-30 the Committee on Grants-in-Aid—Blair Stewart (chairman), Paul W. Gates, Earl Latham, John W. Riley, Jr., and George W. Stocking—made the following 25 awards to assist research projects undertaken by individual scholars:

Aaron I. Abell, Associate Professor of History, University of Notre Dame, for study of the battle for social liberalism in American Catholicism, 1865-1925.

Samuel H. Beer, Associate Professor of Government, Harvard University, for an inquiry into the economic planning function of the British Treasury.

Richard M. Brace, Associate Professor of History, Northwestern University, for "A History of the Girondins," a study of moderantism during revolution.

Reynold E. Carlson, Associate Professor of Economics, Vanderbilt University, for a study of banking and economic development in Latin America.

Dora Mae Clark, Professor of American History and Political Science, Wilson College, for a study of the British Treasury in the administration of the American colonies in the eighteenth century.

Ossip K. Flechtheim, Associate Professor of Government and History, Colby College, for a historical and sociological study of the Communist movement in Germany, 1844-1950.

Amos H. Hawley, Associate Professor of Sociology, University of Michigan, for a study of metropolitan community research methodology.

August B. Hollingshead, Associate Professor of Sociology, Yale University, for a study of sociological factors in the selection of marriage mates.

Victor L. Johnson, Professor of History, Muhlenberg College, for a study of the impact of the American Revolution upon the Philadelphia area.

Weymouth T. Jordan, Professor of History, Florida State University, for a study of Noah B. Cloud and the promotion of Southern agriculture.

Samuel Koenig, Assistant Professor of Sociology and Anthropology, Brooklyn College, for a study of the emerging cultural patterns in Israel.

Maurice H. Krout, Executive Director, Chicago Psychological Institute, Instructor in Psychology, Chicago City Junior College, for a factorial analysis of the "Personal Preference Scale."

Robert Langer, Lecturer in Government, Columbia University, for a study in Yugoslavia of constitutional, administrative and judicial institutions.

Seymour M. Lipset, Assistant Professor of Sociology, University of California, for a study of the institutionalized two-party system in the International Typographical Union.

Harry M. Mason, Associate Professor of Psychology, Whitman College, for a study of the effect of personal values upon the understandability of spoken language.

Paul W. Massing, Lecturer in Sociology, Rutgers University, for a study of the dichotomy of private and public mores in Germany.

Henry F. May, Associate Professor of American History, Scripps College, for a study of the decline of American radicalism, 1912-24.

Paul H. Mussen, Assistant Professor of Psychology, University of Wisconsin, for a study of personality and social factors in political activity and apathy.

Franz L. Neumann, Professor of Government, Columbia University, for a study of the political significance and political attitudes of the non-Communist European international labor movement.

Harry H. Pierce, Instructor in History, Syracuse University, for a study of the financing of railroads in New York State, 1826-75.

R. Vance Presthus, Assistant Professor of Political Science, University of Southern California, for a study of local participation under the British Town and Country Planning Act of 1947.

Sterling D. Spero, Associate Professor of Public Administration, New York University, for a study of the place of the employee in nationalized industry in Great Britain.

David Spring, Assistant Professor of History, Johns Hopkins University, for a study of the English landed classes in the nineteenth century.

Theodore Stern, Assistant Professor of Anthropology, University of Oregon, for a study of a pluriracial community in Oregon.

Walter A. Weisskopf, Professor of Economics, Roosevelt College, for a study of the social psychology of economic thought.



## PUBLICATIONS

### SSRC BULLETINS AND MONOGRAPHS

- Tensions Affecting International Understanding: A Survey of Research*, Bulletin 62, by Otto Klineberg. May 1950. 238 pp. Paper, \$1.75; cloth, \$2.25.
- Production of New Housing: A Research Monograph on Efficiency in Production*, by Leo Grebler. February 1950. 195 pp. \$1.75.
- Labor-Management Relations: A Research Planning Memorandum*, Bulletin 61, by John G. Turnbull. October 1949. 121 pp. \$1.25.
- The Pre-election Polls of 1948: Report to the Committee on Analysis of Pre-election Polls and Forecasts*, Bulletin 60, by Frederick Mosteller, Herbert Hyman, Philip J. McCarthy, Eli S. Marks, David B. Truman, with the collaboration of L. W. Doob, Duncan MacRae, Jr., F. F. Stephan, S. A. Stouffer, S. S. Wilks. September 1949. 416 pp. Paper, \$2.50; cloth, \$3.00.

The Council's bulletins, monographs, and pamphlets are distributed from the New York office of the Council.

### BOOKS

- The Corporation in New Jersey: Business and Politics, 1791-1875* by John W. Cadman, Jr. Published in cooperation with the Committee on Economic History. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1949. 479 pp. \$6.00.
- Steamboats on the Western Rivers: An Economic and Technological History* by Louis C. Hunter. Published in cooperation with the Committee on Economic History, the American Historical Association, and the American Council of Learned Societies. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1949. 699 pp. \$10.00.
- Studies in Social Psychology in World War II*, Vol. I, *The American Soldier: Adjustment During Army Life* by S. A. Stouffer, E. A. Suchman, L. C. DeViney, S. A. Star, and R. M. Williams, Jr.; Vol. II, *The American Soldier: Combat and Its Aftermath* by S. A. Stouffer, A. A. Lumsdaine, M. H. Lumsdaine, R. M. Williams, Jr., M. B. Smith, I. L. Janis, S. A. Star, and L. S. Cottrell, Jr.; Vol. III, *Experiments on Mass Communication* by C. I. Hovland, A. A. Lumsdaine, and F. D. Sheffield; Vol. IV, *Measurement and Prediction* by S. A. Stouffer, Louis Guttman, E. A. Suchman, P. F. Lazarsfeld, S. A. Star, and J. A. Clausen. Prepared under the auspices of the Com-

mittee on Analysis of Experience of Research Branch, Information and Education Division, ASF. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1949. Vol. I, 612 pp.; Vol. II, 676 pp.; together, \$13.50; separately, \$7.50. Vol. III, 356 pp., \$5.00. Vol. IV, about 750 pp. June 1950. \$10.00.

- The Library's Public* by Bernard Berelson (194 pp., \$3.00); *The Public Library in the Political Process* by Oliver Garceau (281 pp., \$3.75); *Government Publications for the Citizen* by James L. McCamy (153 pp., \$2.50); *The Book Industry* by William Miller (170 pp., \$2.75); *The Information Film* by Gloria Waldron (299 pp., \$3.75). Prepared under the auspices of the Public Library Inquiry Committee, the last-named volume in cooperation with the Twentieth Century Fund. New York: Columbia University Press, 1949.
- War-time Industrial Statistics* by David Novick and George A. Steiner. Prepared with the aid of the Council's former Committee on War Studies. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1949. 242 pp. Paper, \$2.00; cloth, \$3.00.

## ANNOUNCEMENT

### FELLOWSHIPS AND GRANTS

The next closing dates for receipt of applications for Council fellowships and other grants will be as follows:

- Research Training Fellowships*: August 15, 1950, for awards to be made in October by the Committee on Social Science Personnel.
- Area Research Training Fellowships and Travel Grants for Area Research*: September 18, 1950, for awards to be made in November by the Committee on Area Research Training Fellowships.
- Grants-in-Aid of Research*: January 15, 1951, for awards to be made about April 1, 1951 by the Committee on Grants-in-Aid.
- Faculty Research Fellowships*: Preliminary nominations of candidates for awards to become effective at any time during the academic year 1950-51 must be filed not later than June 15. Preliminary nominations for appointments to become effective during the academic year 1951-52 must be filed not later than January 15, 1951 and preferably well in advance of that date.

Inquiries concerning each type of award should be addressed to the Washington office of the Council, 726 Jackson Place, N. W., Washington 6, D. C.

## SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH COUNCIL

230 PARK AVENUE, NEW YORK 17, N. Y.

Incorporated in the State of Illinois, December 27, 1924, for the purpose of advancing research in the social sciences

**Directors 1950:** RALPH L. BEALS, WENDELL C. BENNETT, SHEPARD B. CLOUGH, LEONARD S. COTTRELL, JR., J. FREDERIC DEWHURST, FREDERICK S. DUNN, ELMER ELLIS, ROBERT B. HALL, PHILIP M. HAUSER, PENDLETON HERRING, WILLARD HURST, HAROLD A. INNIS, OTTO KLINEBERG, CLYDE KLUCK-HOHN, LYLE H. LANIER, ALEXANDER LEIGHTON, ARTHUR W. MACMAHON, DONALD G. MARQUIS, ROY F. NICHOLS, FREDERICK OSBORN, DON K. PRICE, ROBERT R. SEARS, JOSEPH J. SPENGLER, GEORGE W. STOCKING, DOROTHY S. THOMAS, S. S. WILKS, MALCOLM M. WILLEY, HOLBROOK WORKING, DONALD YOUNG, KIMBALL YOUNG

**Officers and Staff:** PENDLETON HERRING, *President*; PAUL WEBBINK, *Vice-President*; ELBRIDGE SIBLEY, *Executive Associate*; RICHARD H. HEINDEL, *Executive Associate*; ELEANOR C. ISBELL; JOSEPH B. CASAGRANDE; HAROLD E. JONES, *Pacific Coast Representative*; CAROLYN E. ALLEN, *Controller*